

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 8, 11, and 16 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 1-20 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,535,749 (hereafter Iwata). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A handheld computer comprising:  
a processor module comprising a processor and a display;  
a sliding display cover moveably coupled to said processor module;  
a sensing device coupled to said processor module and to said sliding display cover for providing geometric information for a plurality of positions indicating **a relative position of an edge of said sliding display cover with respect to said display**, and wherein said **relative position indicates a location of a displayed object on said display**; and  
a device driver for **performing an action corresponding to said displayed object indicated by said relative position, wherein said performance of said action is initiated by a user.**  
(emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Iwata does not teach, suggest, or motivate the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, the

Independent Claim 1 recites the limitations, "***a relative position of an edge of said sliding display cover with respect to said display***," (emphasis added), "wherein said ***relative position indicates a location of a displayed object on said display***," (emphasis added), and "a device driver for ***performing an action corresponding to said displayed object indicated by said relative position, wherein said performance of said action is initiated by a user***," (emphasis added). On pages 4 and 5 of the Final Office Action, it was stated that Iwata is silent about the claim limitation "wherein said relative position identifies a displayed object on said display" and that the Applicant needed to specify whether the identification of the displayed object is done automatically or manually. Further, it was stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute applicant's described structure, by modifying the Iwata's invention with a switch to identify the relative position of displayed object on the display.

First, the prima facie case for obviousness requires three basic criteria to be met. Initially, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Secondly, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Herein, the claim limitation “wherein said relative position identifies a displayed object on said display” has been changed to “wherein said relative position indicates a location of a displayed object on said display”. It is respectfully submitted that Iwata is also silent about the claim limitation, “wherein said relative position indicates a location of a displayed object on said display”, of Independent Claim 1. Moreover, Iwata shows that slide cover (7) slides to different positions with respect to the display (4) in Figures 1 and 2. However, there is no displayed object on the display (4). Hence, Iwata fails to teach, suggest, or motivate that the relative position indicates a location of a displayed object on the display, wherein the relative position is the relative position of an edge of the sliding display cover with respect to the display, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Further, the citation (Col. 5, lines 64-67) in Iwata referenced at page 4 of the Final Office Action fails to teach, suggest, or motivate a device driver for performing an action corresponding to the displayed object indicated by the relative position, wherein the performance of the action is initiated by a user, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Since Iwata fails to show displayed objects in Figures 1 and 2, Iwata also fails to show performance of an action corresponding to the displayed object indicated by the relative position. Furthermore, Iwata does not discuss any correspondence between an action and a displayed object.

Finally, the statement “modifying the Iwata’s invention with a switch to identify the relative position of displayed object on the display” is unsupported by some suggestion or motivation, as required for a prima facie case for obviousness.

As described above, Iwata does not teach, suggest, or motivate the cited claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over Iwata and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-7 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Iwata. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-7 are patentable over Iwata for the reasons discussed above.

Independent Claim 8 recites (as amended):

A method of selecting an option in an electronic device comprising a processor module and a sliding cover, said method comprising:

- a) ***displaying an object on a display screen*** of said processor module;
- b) selecting an action of said electronic device, ***wherein said action is associated with said object***, wherein ***said selecting comprises indicating said object by positioning an edge of said sliding cover adjacent to said object***;
- c) activating a selection device of said electronic device; and
- d) invoking said action of said electronic device in response to said activating. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Iwata does not teach, suggest, or motivate the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 8. In particular,

Independent Claim 8 recites the limitations, "***displaying an object on a display screen*** of said processor module," (emphasis added), and "selecting an action of said electronic device, ***wherein said action is associated with said object***, wherein ***said selecting comprises indicating said object by positioning an edge of said sliding cover adjacent to said object***," (emphasis added). In contrast, Iwata shows that slide cover (7) slides to different positions with respect to the display (4) in Figures 1 and 2. However, there is no displaying an object on the display (4). Hence, Iwata fails to teach, suggest, or motivate selecting an action of the electronic device, wherein the action is associated with the object, wherein the selecting comprises indicating the object by positioning an edge of the sliding cover adjacent to the object, as in the invention of Independent Claim 8.

As described above, Iwata does not teach, suggest, or motivate the cited claim limitations of Independent Claim 8. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 8 is patentable over Iwata and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 9-15 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 8, which is allowable over Iwata. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-15 are patentable over Iwata for the reasons discussed above.

Independent Claim 16 recites (as amended):

A computer readable medium containing executable instructions which, when executed in a handheld computer comprising a display, causes the handheld computer to configure a visual output of the display, comprising instructions for:

sensing a relative position of a sliding cover and a processor module, wherein said relative position is a partially closed position;  
generating said visual output on said display, wherein said visual output comprises visual objects arranged to be viewable in response to said relative position, wherein ***said generating comprises one of scaling the size of said visual output, implementing a scrolling feature for said visual output, and any combination thereof.***  
(emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that Iwata does not teach, suggest, or motivate the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 16. In particular, Independent Claim 16 recites the limitation, "wherein ***said generating comprises one of scaling the size of said visual output, implementing a scrolling feature for said visual output, and any combination thereof,***" (emphasis added). In contrast, Iwata shows that slide cover (7) slides to different positions with respect to the display (4) in Figures 1 and 2. Moreover, Iwata states that, based on the detected location of the slide cover (7), a display switch limits the display area of display (4) to the area, for example, shown in Figure 1, and performs turning process for the display characters and symbols by 90 degrees. [Iwata; Col. 13, lines 42-60]. However, Iwata fails to teach, suggest, or motivate generating the visual output, wherein the generating comprises one of scaling the size of the visual output, implementing a scrolling feature for the visual output, and any combination thereof, as in the invention of Independent Claim 16.

As described above, Iwata does not teach, suggest, or motivate the cited claim limitation of Independent Claim 16. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 16 is patentable over Iwata and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 17-20 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 16, which is allowable over Iwata. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 17-20 are patentable over Iwata for the reasons discussed above.

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-20) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 2/1/2006

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia  
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060